

the plan; they are smart enough to know a losing campaign when they see one. Instead, they are trying to get the election called on a technicality.

PhRMA, the drug industry, and the Republicans are counting on PhRMA's money, the miracle pill that has worked before, to make its problems go away. I do not know if that trusty remedy will work this time. There is a growing understanding in Ohio, and I think there is throughout the country, that when push comes to shove the drug industry's priority is profit, not patient safety. If the drug company's real priority is patient safety, why are they spending so much money to ensure that we cannot afford the medicine that so many of us need?

FULFILLING OUR PROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House of Representatives will implement another item on the President's agenda. We have been voting for 6 years to ban the cruel and unnecessary violence of partial-birth abortion. At long last, Congress will take the same decision our constituents took years ago. We will call infanticide by its name.

The House is well aware of the debate, and we will repeat it once again before we finally send this legislation to a President who is willing to sign it. It will become law. And when it does, we will become a slightly better Nation for it.

But beyond the specific victory this will be for its tireless proponents, the passage and enactment of the Partial-Birth Abortion Act will be a victory for the American families we were sent here to serve.

Last November, in the face of uncertainties about war in Iraq and a sagging economy, the American people elected this Congress to get things done. Our mandate was to rise above partisan gridlock to complement President Bush's leadership instead of undermining it. Five months into our first session, we have passed major legislation not just in the House but in the Senate as well. And we are not just passing paper, we are passing laws.

In addition to the partial-birth abortion ban, the Armed Services Naturalization Act has significant bipartisan support and can quickly become law. We are also pursuing the President's initiative to reform Medicare with a prescription drug benefit to help those seniors who need it the most. This is on top of the jobs and growth package to create more than 1 million new jobs and provide for our economic security.

And the global AIDS bill to help curb the spread of HIV/AIDS in the most vulnerable regions of this world. And

the Child Protection Act to prevent and punish sexual predation against our children. And the war budget to fund the liberation of Iraq and the reconstruction of its government.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is helping this President produce results. And with every law we pass and he signs, we move another step closer to fulfilling America's promise and, just as important, fulfilling our promise to America.

BAIT AND SWITCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not say is that what this piece of legislation on the floor today does is take away a woman's right to choose, take away a woman's right to reproductive freedom, and it is part of a concerted effort on behalf of the Republican Party to pack the courts with judges who would repeal *Roe v. Wade*. That is what the real issue is when it comes to this piece of legislation the gentleman from Texas just talked about.

Mr. Speaker, last month, President Bush visited my home State of New Mexico. He came to sell his tax cut. The President said, and what many of his minions have been saying over the last couple of months, is that every taxpayer was going to be helped by this tax cut. He emphasized how the child tax credit would help all taxpayers. Well, now the bill has been signed and we have read the fine print, and guess what? New Mexico, in fact, is going to get very little in the way of a tax cut for working families. Virtually nothing. Zero. Nada.

When I was Attorney General and we used to work on cases called consumer scams, we used to call this tactic bait and switch: tell them one thing to sell them the idea and complete the sale, and give them something completely different and hope they will never find out. Bait and switch. One of the oldest consumer scams. That is what this tax cut was all about.

The Republican National Committee is also in on this scam. The committee, on its Web site, asks the question: Who benefits under the President's plan? And I read from the Web site: "Everyone who pays taxes, especially middle income Americans."

Why bait and switch? Because they do not want you to know who gets the lion's share of benefits from this tax cut: millionaires. In 2005, 200,000 taxpayers making \$1 million or more will get 44 percent of the benefits. Eight million, mostly low- and middle-income taxpayers will not receive any benefit, not a penny from the law. Forty times as many taxpayers who get no benefit from the cuts as there are millionaires who get 44 percent of

the law's benefits. Let me repeat: 40 times as many taxpayers who get no benefit from the cuts as there are millionaires who get 44 percent of the law's benefits.

What can we say about a tax cut and a fiscal policy which rewards the rich at the expense of the middle income? What can we say about a tax cut which will force us to cut health care, education, and homeland security? What can we say about a tax cut and fiscal policy which deprives the government of revenue it needs to make the United States a strong and vital Nation?

The normally staid Financial Times of Britain answered the question this way: the lunatics are now in charge of the asylum. The lunatics are now in charge of the asylum.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PACKAGE IMPORTANT FOR RURAL HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a Member of Congress to emphasize the importance of passing a meaningful, comprehensive prescription drug package now. But I know my voice is small, even as a Member of Congress, compared to a senior citizen who has to choose between paying for living expenses or prescription drugs. That voice needs to be heard in Congress.

I heard that voice in Paw Paw, West Virginia. I heard that voice in Martinsburg, West Virginia. And I heard that voice again in Mill Creek, Moorefield, Franklin, Gassaway, and Cedar Grove. Those are all of the towns in West Virginia that I visited and have visited during my year-long district tour of rural health centers and during the last two district work periods.

I am sure I will hear that voice again when I visit more rural health care centers. I will probably hear it more from women, because women represent 72 percent of the population age 65 and older.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, women are more likely to have lower incomes in their retirements. There are twice as many women as men 65 years or older with annual incomes less than \$10,000.

I want to modernize Medicare with a guaranteed prescription drug benefit so when I visit my district again and resume my rural health tour, it is not to hear what the problem is, but to say that the problem has been worked on and a solution has been passed by this Congress.

MISGUIDED REPUBLICAN POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Pursuant to the order of the

House of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to applaud the process that is beginning in the Middle East this very morning. I remind my colleagues of the long journey that we have taken toward peace. I am reminded of the continuous and ongoing negotiations of the administration of President William Jefferson Clinton, who believed in the concept of peace in the Middle East. I recall the near-midnight negotiations prior to the inauguration of this President that President Clinton engaged in. The single word I remind my colleagues of is "engagement."

I am reminded of my floor speech in February, 2001, saying to the new administration that you cannot cease to engage in the peace process of the Middle East. Unfortunately, our voices were not listened to, and so for at least a 9-to-10-month period the suicide bombings continued, the lack of engagement promoted nonpeace in the Middle East.

Today, I am gratified that there is now a recognition that the only way we can bring the parties to the table is to remain engaged. I encourage and, of course, ask that this administration not make this a 48-hour tailspin of meetings and greetings, but that we seriously continue to engage with our friends in the Middle East, the Palestinians and the Israelis, and work with them hand in hand on the question of peace. I would ask that we continue to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word about the three-vote removal of the First Amendment yesterday by the FCC. Unfortunately, three Republican commissioners decided that the First Amendment did not need to be promoted in this Nation by allowing the media to be able to conglomerate print, TV, and radio in one hand. I had a town hall meeting by radio, by KPFT, where 5,000 people listened to one of the commissioners who had sense and indicated that America does itself a disservice when America extinguishes the voices of opposition.

In small or rural markets where one conglomerate owns every voice, we will not hear a different perspective. Shame on the FCC. I call on this Congress to do something that makes sense and speak on behalf of the American people and reignite the First Amendment.

Let me conclude by making an announcement to just be able to reaffirm that all of the promises made by the \$350 billion tax cut is nothing but garbage. There is no truth in it whatsoever; and I am proud to stand here and say I voted against it. The New York Daily News says the poorest suffer the unkindest. They were told they were going to get a child tax credit, and if you are the working poor, working every day, providing for your family, guess what, you do not get a \$400 check

in the mail, you get zero because, unfortunately, all of the folk rushing to give all of the money to the richest of this Nation forgot about giving a tax cut to those who deserve it the most.

And let me cite the New York Times on Sunday, June 1, that says "Second study finds gaps in tax cuts." The gaps are that working Americans do not really get the tax cut that they need, that 95 percent of this money goes to those making \$374,000. Former Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neill said this is an economy geared towards the richest. It says, "Clearly, low-income taxpayers will not receive any benefits from this law." It goes on to cite the egregiousness of the \$350 billion tax cut where working poor, making \$10,000 a year, do not get a child tax credit.

Do Members know how many children they represent in America? Twelve million children are not impacted by this tax cut. Now we have the other body trying to fix it by proposing a Senate bill, if you will, that fixes it; but let me tell you how long it takes for a bill to get through this Congress: a long time. They are even debating the fact whether or not an opponent of the bill will require 60 votes.

I can assure Members that all of the voices that were raised telling Members this was a bogus tax cut, those suggesting it would create jobs, what a joke. It takes a million dollars to create two jobs under the Bush plan. If the Democratic plan had passed, we would have had investment in health care and investment in homeland security. We would have had investment in transportation. What would that have done to the increasing job loss? It would have created more jobs.

Mr. Speaker, a bogus tax plan has been passed. Americans need to wake up and deal with the idea of fighting for what is right. We will continue to fight for it and find a way to provide jobs and opportunities for Americans.

ESTABLISHING FAIRNESS IN TAX CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend President Bush for his leadership, to thank this Congress for passing a tax plan that is predicted by outside and independent economists to generate about 1.3 million new jobs over the next 18 months, legislation that says if you pay Federal income taxes, you will receive Federal income tax relief.

For the people of Illinois that I represent, it is estimated that the average Illinois family will see an extra thousand dollars in higher take-home pay. If they are Federal income taxpayers, they will receive Federal income tax relief.

The bottom line is that it will create jobs. If we put extra money in the

pocketbook of workers, we put incentives for workers to invest, and it creates jobs.

One of the issues I have been involved in over the last several years has been an effort to bring fairness to the Tax Code, and that is to address the issue of the marriage tax penalty. A quirk in the Tax Code or a complicated Tax Code which has gotten more complicated over the years where you had a situation where both the husband and wife were in the workforce, and because they both are in the workforce and pay Federal income taxes, when they file, as married, they file jointly, combine their incomes, and that pushes them into a higher tax bracket; whereas if they lived together and filed as two single people, they would have saved money. Is that right, that under our Tax Code 42 million married working couples paid on average \$1,700 in higher taxes just because they are married?

I have an example of a couple in Joliet, Illinois, that I represent, Jose and Magdalena Castillo. They are construction workers in Joliet. Their son is Eduardo and their daughter is Carolina. For them, their marriage tax penalty has been about \$1,400. For them, \$1,400, that is several months' worth of car payments or day-care for their children while they are at work, or home mortgage payments for this family. So eliminating the marriage tax penalty and bringing fairness to the Tax Code will make a big difference in the lives of the Castillos of Joliet, Illinois.

I am proud to say in the first tax cut of 2001, we passed the first effort into law to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It had twice been vetoed by Bill Clinton, but President Bush signed it into law, an effort to phase out the marriage action penalty. I am pleased to commend the President for signing into law the Jobs and Economic Growth Package that made effective this year the elimination of the marriage tax penalty. So rather than Jose and Magdalena Castillo having to wait over this decade for the marriage tax penalty to be eliminated, we eliminated it this year.

So that means the Castillos will have an extra \$1,400 that they will be able to spend at home to take care of their family's needs, make some improvements around the house, buy some back-to-school clothes, and make a down payment on a new car. That creates jobs.

I am pleased to say the President signed the legislation passed by a majority of the House and the Senate, which will eliminate the marriage tax penalty now.

When we think about it, this unfairness in the Tax Code had existed for years, and those on the other side of the aisle, they resisted efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. They said we could better spend the money here in Washington than Jose and Magdalena Castillo back in Joliet, Illinois. I am pleased to say that a majority of this House believes that Jose and